

Supplementary Data_2

Table S1: Study characteristics of the articles reported in this review. Blank cells indicate that no data was provided, while "0" indicate no outcomes were observed: PPF - Periprosthetic Fractures; St - Surgical time (mins); Rt - Radiation time (secs); HS - Hospital Stay (days); Is - Implant Size (number of screw holes).

Paper	No. Pts (Total availabl e)	Mean age	Follow up details				Fracture Characteristics								Surgical Details			
			RIP	Other	No. Pts (available for follow- up)	Mean Follow up time	Open	PPF	32			33			St	Rt	HS	IS
									A	B	C	A	B	C				
Zhang et al. [1]	31	46.2	0	0	31	14.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	79.1		10	
Hanschen et al. [2]	12	62.9	0	0	12	12	3	1	0	0	0	5	1	5	134.1	188.9		9.3
Kregor et al. [3]	66	49.0	0	0	66	9			0	0	0	33	0	33	209			
Syed et al. [4]	29	65.3	3	1	25	18	4		3	0	0	4	2	9				
Lill et al. [5]	20	44.8	0	0	20	53	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	7				
Tank et al. [6]	21	61.4	0	0	21	11.8	6		0	0	0	9	0	12				
Kanabar et al. [7]	17	65.3	1	0	16	12	3		0	0	0	8	0	9				9
Weight et al. [8]	26	44.0	2	3	21	18	6	2	0	0	0	7	0	15				
Schutz et al. [9]	112	54.0	8	8	96	13.7	34	12	1 2	1 4	5	27	6	52				10
Canadian Orthopaedic Trauma Society et al. [10]	28	0.0	2	4	22				0	0	0							
Markmiller et al. [11]	16	57.2	0	0	16			6	0	0	0	10	0	10	155			9
Buckley et al. [12]	13	55.8	0	0	13		0		0	0	0	9	0	4				
Fankhauser et al. [13]	29	57.0	2	0	27	20	14		0	0	0	10	0	19			22	
Schandelmaier et al. [14]	29	54.0	0	0	29	6	8	2	0	3	0	8	1	17	131	142		9
Kayali et al. [15]	26	49.0	0	0	26	25.8	7		0	0	0	14	0	13			12.6	
Gavaskar et al. [16]	20	73.0	0	0	20	39		19										
Kiluçoğlu et al. [17]	16	76.7	0	7	9	21		9										
Demirtas et al. [18]	18	36.0	0	13	5	31.3	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	7				
Park et al. [19]	41	75.0	0	20	21	30.5	0	21	0	0	0	21	0	0				
Kolb et al. [20]	50	49.0		19	31	29	5		0	0	0	7	0	24	135	140		10
Kolb [21]	23	77.0	3	1	19	46	0	19						19	127	135		11

Aldrian [22]	86	75.6	0	38	48	12											
Batista [23]	32	47.3	0	4	28	21.3	15					7		22			7.8
Horneff [24]	63	68.3	0	35	28	6		28							155.3		
Smith [25]	52	74.0	2	0	50	6											
Southeast Fracture Consortium et al. [26]	339	56.0	0	154	185		78	30									
Ricci et al. [27]	25	41.0	2	5	18	30	10							19			
Toole et al. [28]	24	79.5	4	1	19	11	0	24				24			110.2		10
Althausen et al. [29]	11	82.8		6	5	2.7		5				5			135		
Hierholzer et al. [30]	115	54.0		59	56	15	31					21		35			
Hoffmann et al. [31]	54	73.2	0	19	35	22	2	36				36					6.9
Apostolou et al. [32]	19	60.4	3	9	7	16	2	3				4		4			
Christ et al. [33]	40	76.0		33	7	21.4		7									
Gao et al. [34]	36	54.7		17	19	23.4						19			79.7		
Liu et al. [35]	189	49.0	0	104	85	27			4	3	1	29	7	40			
Wong et al. [36]	16	75.0	0	0	16	23						8	3	5			
Srinivas et al. [37]	40	67.0	3	0	37	12		14	1 3	2	3	15		4			
Batchelor et al. [38]	27	64.7	0	8	19	30									118.4		11.7
Kregor et al. [39]	119	52.0	3	14	102	14	35					44		59	183		11
Ehlinger et al. [40]	16	81.0	0	0	16	36.5	0	16									
Schütz et al. [41]	62	52.4	8	2	52		21					22		44	112.6	220.8	9
Fulkerson et al. [42]	26	69.4	0	2	24	27		24							90		
Schandelmaier et al. [43]	29	54.0	0	0	29	6	8			3		8	1	17	131	142	10
Wick et al. [44]	18	80.3	0	9	9	18.2						9			102.3	43	12.7
Hahn et al. [45]	10	49.7	1	1	8		3	1				2		8			
Schütz et al. [46]	112	54.0	8	7	97	13.7											
Schandelmaier et al. [47]	51	53.0	2	1	48		10	6				10	2	36	137	127	9
Sreedhar et al. [48]	30	37.0	0	0	30												
Abdelmonem et al. [49]	20	52.8	0	0	20							14		6			
Paulsson et al. [50] - FWB group	11	52.8	1	1	9			4				5	1	1	83		14.6
Paulsson et al. [50] - PWB group	21	79.2	3	2	16			8				7		3	104		14.3
Jang et al. [51] – Group 1	33	81.3	0	0	33			1							149		10.9
Jang et al. [51] – Group 2	32	51.0	0	0	32			4							165		11.3

[illegible]

References

- [1] Zhang R, Yang Z, Chen K, Guo X, Huang W. Clinical effect of three-dimensional printing assisted less invasive stabilization system (LISS) to treat femoral intercondylar fracture. *Int J Clin Exp Med* 2018;11:10809–14.
- [2] Hanschen M, Biberthaler P. Re: Mono- versus polyaxial locking plates in distal femur fractures: a prospective randomized multicentre clinical trial. *Int Orthop* 2014;38:1751–2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-014-2385-z>.
- [3] Kregor PJ, Hughes JL, Cole PA. Fixation of distal femoral fractures above total knee arthroplasty utilizing the Less Invasive Stabilization System (L.I.S.S.). *Injury* 2001;32:64–75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-1383\(01\)00185-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-1383(01)00185-1).
- [4] Syed AA, Agarwal M, Giannoudis P V., Matthews SJEE, Smith RM. Distal femoral fractures: long-term outcome following stabilisation with the LISS. *Injury* 2004;35:599–607. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-1383\(03\)00247-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-1383(03)00247-X).
- [5] Lill M, Attal R, Rudisch A, Wick MC, Blauth M, Lutz M. Does MIPO of fractures of the distal femur result in more rotational malalignment than ORIF? A retrospective study. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg* 2016;42:733–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-015-0595-8>.
- [6] Tank JC, Schneider PS, Davis E, Galpin M, Prasarn ML, Choo AM, et al. Early mechanical failures of the synthes variable angle locking distal femur plate. *J Orthop Trauma* 2016;30:e7–11. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0000000000000391>.
- [7] Kanabar P, Kumar V, Owen PJ, Rushton N. Less invasive stabilisation system plating for distal femoral fractures. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong)* 2007;15:299–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/230949900701500311>.
- [8] Weight M, Collinge C. Early results of the Less Invasive Stabilization System for mechanically unstable fractures of the distal femur (AO/OTA types A2, A3, C2, and C3). *J Orthop Trauma* 2004;18:503–8. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005131-200409000-00005>.
- [9] Schütz M, Müller M, Krettek C, Höntzsch D, Regazzoni P, Ganz R, et al. Minimally invasive fracture stabilization of distal femoral fractures with the LISS: A prospective multicenter study results of a clinical study with special emphasis on difficult cases. *Injury* 2001;32:48–54. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-1383\(01\)00183-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-1383(01)00183-8).
- [10] Canadian Orthopaedic Trauma Society. Are locking constructs in distal femoral fractures always best? A prospective multicenter randomized controlled trial comparing the less invasive stabilization system with the minimally invasive dynamic condylar screw system. *J Orthop Trauma* 2016;30:e1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0000000000000450>.
- [11] Markmiller M, Konrad G, Südkamp N. Femur-LISS and distal femoral nail for fixation of distal femoral fractures: Are there differences in outcome and complications? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2004;426:252–7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.blo.0000141935.86481.ba>.
- [12] Buckley R, Mohanty K, Malish D, Buckley R, Mohanty K, Malish D. Lower limb malrotation following MIPO technique of distal femoral and proximal tibial fractures. *Injury* 2011;42:194–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2010.08.024>.
- [13] Fankhauser F, Gruber G, Schippinger G, Boldin C, Hofer HP, Grechenig W, et al. Minimal-invasive treatment of distal femoral fractures with the LISS (Less Invasive Stabilization System) - A prospective study of 30 fractures with a follow up of 20 months. *ACTA Orthop Scand* 2004;75:56–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00016470410001708110>.

- [14] Schandelmaier P, Krettek C, Miclau T, Stephan C, Konemann B, Tscherne H. Stabilization of distal femoral fractures using the LISS. *Tech Orthop* 1999;14:230–46. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00013611-199909000-00009>.
- [15] Kayali C, Agus H, Turgut A. Successful results of minimally invasive surgery for comminuted supracondylar femoral fractures with LISS: comparative study of multiply injured and isolated femoral fractures. *J Orthop Sci* 2007;12:458–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00776-007-1156-8>.
- [16] Gavaskar AS, Tummala NC, Subramanian M. The outcome and complications of the locked plating management for the periprosthetic distal femur fractures after a total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Surg* 2013;5:124–8. <https://doi.org/10.4055/cios.2013.5.2.124>.
- [17] Kılıçoğlu OI, Akgül T, Sağlam Y, Yazicioğlu O. Comparison of locked plating and intramedullary nailing for periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures after knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop Belg* 2013;79:417–21.
- [18] Demirtas A, Azboy I, Özkul E, Gem M, Alemdar C. Comparison of retrograde intramedullary nailing and bridge plating in the treatment of extra-articular fractures of the distal femur. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* 2014;48:521–6. <https://doi.org/10.3944/AOTT.2014.14.0004>.
- [19] Park J, Lee J, Lee JH. Comparison of retrograde nailing and minimally invasive plating for treatment of periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures (OTA 33-A) above total knee arthroplasty. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2016;136:331–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00402-015-2374-8>.
- [20] Kolb W, Guhlmann H, Windisch C, Marx F, Kolb K, Koller H. Fixation of distal femoral fractures with the less invasive stabilization system: A minimally invasive treatment with locked fixed-angle screws. *J Trauma Inj Infect Crit Care* 2008;65:1425–34. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e318166d24a>.
- [21] Kolb W, Guhlmann H, Windisch C, Marx F, Koller H, Kolb K. Fixation of periprosthetic femur fractures above total knee arthroplasty with the less invasive stabilization system: A midterm follow-up study. *J Trauma - Inj Infect Crit Care* 2010;69:670–6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/TA.0b013e3181c9ba3b>.
- [22] Aldrian S, Schuster R, Haas N, Erhart J, Strickner M, Blutsch B, et al. Fixation of supracondylar femoral fractures following total knee arthroplasty: is there any difference comparing angular stable plate fixation versus rigid interlocking nail fixation? *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2013;133:921–7. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00402-013-1730-9>.
- [23] Batista BB, Salim R, Paccola CAJ, Kfuri Junior M. Internal fixators: a safe option for managing distal femur fractures? *Acta Ortopédica Bras* 2014;22:159–62. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1413-78522014220300509>.
- [24] Horneff JG, Scolaro JA, Jafari SM, Mirza A, Parvizi J, Mehta S. Intramedullary Nailing Versus Locked Plate for Treating Supracondylar Periprosthetic Femur Fractures. *Orthopedics* 2013;36:e561--e566. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20130426-16>.
- [25] Smith WR, Stoneback JW, Morgan SJ, Stahel PF. Is immediate weight bearing safe for periprosthetic distal femur fractures treated by locked plating? A feasibility study in 52 consecutive patients. *Patient Saf Surg* 2016;10:26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13037-016-0114-9>.
- [26] Southeast Fracture Consortium. LCP versus LISS in the treatment of open and closed distal femur fractures: Does it make a difference? *J Orthop Trauma* 2016;30:e212–6. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0000000000000507>.

- [27] Ricci AR, Yue JJ, Taffet R, Catalano JB, DeFalco RA, Wilkens KJ. Less Invasive Stabilization System for treatment of distal femur fractures. *Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ)* 2004;33:250–5.
- [28] O'Toole R V, Gobezie R, Hwang R, Chandler AR, Smith RM, Estok DM, et al. Low complication rate of LISS for femur fractures adjacent to stable hip or knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2006:203–10. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.blo.0000223987.59702.17>.
- [29] Althausen PL, Lee MA, Finkemeier CG, Meehan JP, Rodrigo JJ. Operative stabilization of supracondylar femur fractures above total knee arthroplasty: A comparison of four treatment methods. *J Arthroplasty* 2003;18:834–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-5403\(03\)00339-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-5403(03)00339-5).
- [30] Hierholzer C, Rüden C, Pötzel T, Woltmann A, Bühren V. Outcome analysis of retrograde nailing and less invasive stabilization system in distal femoral fractures: A retrospective analysis. *Indian J Orthop* 2011;45:243. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5413.80043>.
- [31] Hoffmann MF, Jones CB, Sietsema DL, Koenig SJ, Tornetta P. Outcome of periprosthetic distal femoral fractures following knee arthroplasty. *Injury* 2012;43:1084–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2012.01.025>.
- [32] Apostolou CD, Papavasiliou A V., Aslam N, Handley RC, Willett KM. Preliminary results and technical aspects following stabilisation of fractures around the knee with liss. *Inj Extra* 2005;36:529–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2005.02.046>.
- [33] Christ AB, Chawla H, Gausden EB, Villa JC, Wellman DS, Lorch DG, et al. Radiographic and Clinical Outcomes of Periprosthetic Distal Femur Fractures Treated With Open Reduction Internal Fixation. *J Orthop Trauma* 2018;32:515–20. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0000000000001265>.
- [34] Gao K, Gao W, Huang J, Li H, Li F, Tao J, et al. Retrograde Nailing versus Locked Plating of Extra-Articular Distal Femoral Fractures: Comparison of 36 Cases. *Med Princ Pract* 2013;22:161–6. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000342664>.
- [35] Liu F, Tao R, Cao Y, Wang Y, Zhou Z, Wang H, et al. The role of LISS (less invasive stabilisation system) in the treatment of peri-knee fractures. *Injury* 2009;40:1187–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2009.03.012>.
- [36] Wong MK, Leung F, Chow SP. Treatment of distal femoral fractures in the elderly using a less-invasive plating technique. *Int Orthop* 2005;29:117–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-004-0609-3>.
- [37] Srinivas S, Maru M, Lennox C. Treatment of distal femoral fractures using the Less Invasive Stabilisation System (LISS) plates. *J Orthop* 2008;5:6p-6p.
- [38] Batchelor E, Heal C, Haladyn JK, Drobetz H. Treatment of distal femur fractures in a regional Australian hospital. *World J Orthop* 2014;5:379–85. <https://doi.org/10.5312/wjo.v5.i3.379>.
- [39] Kregor PJ, Stannard JA, Zlowodzki M, Cole PA. Treatment of distal femur fractures using the Less Invasive Stabilization System: Surgical experience and early clinical results in 103 fractures. *J Orthop Trauma* 2004;18:509–20. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00005131-200409000-00006>.
- [40] Ehlinger M, Adam P, Abane L, Rahme M, Moor BK, Arlettaz Y, et al. Treatment of periprosthetic femoral fractures of the knee. *Knee Surgery, Sport Traumatol Arthrosc* 2011;19:1473–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-011-1480-6>.
- [41] Schütz M, Müller M, Regazzoni P, Höntzsch D, Krettek C, Van der Werken C, et al. Use of the Less Invasive Stabilization System (LISS) in patients with distal femoral (AO33) fractures: A

- prospective multicenter study. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2005;125:102–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00402-004-0779-x>.
- [42] Fulkerson E, Tejwani N, Stuchin S, Egol K. Management of periprosthetic femur fractures with a first generation locking plate. *Injury* 2007;38:965–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2007.02.026>.
 - [43] Schandelmaier P, Stephan C, Tscherne H. Die kiSS-Platte bei distalen Oberschenkeifrakturen 2000;3:75–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02949871>.
 - [44] Wick M, Müller EJ, Kutscha-Lissberg F, Hopf F, Muhr G. Die operative versorgung suprakondylärer femurfrakturen bei liegender knieendoprothese - “Less invasive stabilization system” (LISS) oder retrograder marknagel? Probleme in der anwendung minimal-invasiver verfahren. *Unfallchirurg* 2004;107:181–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00113-003-0723-5>.
 - [45] Hahn U, Prokop A, Jubel A, Isenberg J, Rehm KE. LISS versus condylar plate. *Kongressband Dtsch Gesellschaft fur Chir Kongress* 2002;119:498–504.
 - [46] Schütz M, Haas NP, Schutz M, Haas NP. LISS--internal plate fixator. *Kongressbd Dtsch Ges Chir Kongr* 2001;118:375–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-56458-1_123.
 - [47] Schandelmaier P, Partenheimer A, Koenemann B, Grün OA, Krettek C. Distal femoral fractures and LISS stabilization. *Injury* 2001;32:55–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-1383\(01\)00184-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0020-1383(01)00184-x).
 - [48] Sreedhar M, M E L, B A, Prashanth P, Swaroopa S, Madhav V. Functional and Radiological Outcome of Distal Femoral Fractures Treated With Locking Compression Plate. *J Evol Med Dent Sci* 2015;4:6664–71. <https://doi.org/10.14260/jemds/2015/964>.
 - [49] Abdelmonem AH, Saber AY, El Sagheir M, El-Malky A. Evaluation of the Results of Minimally Invasive Plate Osteosynthesis Using a Locking Plate in the Treatment of Distal Femur Fractures. *Cureus* 2022;14. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.23617>.
 - [50] Paulsson M, Ekholm C, Jonsson E, Geijer M, Rolfson O. Immediate Full Weight-Bearing Versus Partial Weight-Bearing After Plate Fixation of Distal Femur Fractures in Elderly Patients. A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Geriatr Orthop Surg Rehabil* 2021;12:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21514593211055889>.
 - [51] Jang JH, Rhee SJ, Jun S Bin, Choi YY. Scattering and clustering the proximal screw construct in unilateral locking plate osteosynthesis of distal femoral fractures. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00402-021-03912-1>.
 - [52] Kanakaris NK, Obakponovwe O, Krkovic M, Costa ML, Shaw D, Mohanty KR, et al. Fixation of periprosthetic or osteoporotic distal femoral fractures with locking plates: a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Int Orthop* 2018;(no pagina:1193–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-018-4061-1>.
 - [53] Jain D, Arora R, Garg R, Mahindra P, Selhi HS. Functional outcome of open distal femoral fractures managed with lateral locking plates. *Int Orthop* 2020;44:725–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-019-04347-5>.